



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,956	03/16/2001	Aiko Hanyu	COS-822	7257

7590

11/02/2004

Jim Wheelington  
Fina Technology, Inc.  
P.O. Box 674412  
Houston, TX 77267-4412

EXAMINER

TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/810,956	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HANYU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> D. Lawrence Tarazano	<b>Art Unit</b> 1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-12-2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-11,14-19,22,24,25,28-30,33,35-38,41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-11,14-19,22,24,25,28-30,33,35-38,41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

Art Unit: 1773

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 1, 4, 6-11, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 28-30, 33, 35-38, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The applicants do not have support for an open-ended range with respect to “seal initiation temperature”. The specification recites a lower limit of 80 deg C. The applicants cannot support a range including values under 80 deg C.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 28-30, 33, 35-38, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP-11-060833.

The Japanese patent document teaches monolayer heat sealable films made from a metallocene-catalyzed propylene copolymer. The polymers are isotactic in nature and have random comonomer distributions of the comonomer. The materials have good seal / melt properties [0025] and table 1. The comonomers present include those claimed and they are in the claimed amounts. Given the catalytic systems and the starting materials, there is reason to believe that the materials taught would have the claimed physical properties. The applicants have amended their claims to recite a seal initiation temperature "of less than 125 deg C", and the prior art has values of 127 and 128. The comonomer content for the examples appears to be low (2.6% and 4%). It is well known in the art that the comonomer disrupts the crystal structure of the primary monomer and the more random the packing the lower the melting point / seal initiation temperature. Thus, a higher monomer content would clearly decrease the values and put the seal initiation temperature within the claimed range. Furthermore, the melting points of polymers are not sharp so there is experimental error in the values and the applicants claimed values are not significantly different from the prior art. A two-degree melting difference is not very significant.

The applicants claim oriented films; a film going through an extruder will be oriented to some degree.

It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). When there is sound basis for believing that the

Art Unit: 1773

products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 28-30, 33, 35-38, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-11-060833.

7. The comonomer content as discussed above is within the claimed range. The prior art examples have a low comonomer content. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used higher comonomer contents within the breath of the discourse for applications in which a lower melting point was desired.

8. Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 28-30, 33, 35-38, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0-669-348 A-1 in view of JP-11-060833 or the converse.

The European patent teaches oriented films having a base layer of isotactic polypropylene and a heat sealable propylene layer made by metallocene catalysis. The patent also shows that is

Art Unit: 1773

common in the art to use a sealable layer on a polypropylene substrate to improve the sealing properties of the film.

The Japanese document teaches random / isotactic propylene copolymers made by metallocene catalysis, which have good seal properties.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the materials taught by JP-11-0608833 as the surface layer in the films taught by EP 0-669-348 A-1, in order to produce heat sealable films. The metallocene catalyzed polypropylenes taught are functionally equivalent heat sealable materials, and this is merely the substitution of one functionally equivalent material for another.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the polymers taught by JP-11-060833 in multilayer and optionally oriented films since it is common in the art to make conventional isotactic polypropylene heat sealable by the addition of a sealable layer.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner has withdrawn the rejections based on the EP 0-669-348 A-1 on its own since they clearly teach terpolymers and the applicants' claims are limited to copolymer of ethylene / propylene. However, the examiner takes the position that it clearly teaches oriented films and the reference is relied upon for that feature in the obviousness rejection. The examiner is not convinced by the arguments with respect to the seal initiation temperatures in the prior art as the addition of higher amounts of comonomers would decrease these values.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (571)-272-1515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571)-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lawrence Tarazano  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1773

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DLT', enclosed within a hand-drawn oval shape.